

REMARKS

Present Status of Application

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action tentatively rejected all claims 1-20. Specifically, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatano (US 2002/0002645 A1).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, and 7 and canceled claims 11-20. As amended, the pending independent claims render the rejections moot and these claims clearly define over the cited art of record. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of claims that remain pending.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to FIG. 3 stating that it was not properly labeled. The undersigned has reviewed this figure, but cannot identify any labeling that appears improper. On December 1, 2005, the undersigned phoned the Examiner (and left a voice message) requesting the Examiner to identify the problem with the figure's labeling (since it was not specifically recited in the Office Action). However, the undersigned never received a reply from the Examiner. Accordingly, at this time, no changes have been made to the drawings. If the Examiner will specifically identify what labeling issues need to be changed, the undersigned will be happy to present an appropriate drawing amendment.

Summary of Application

The present application is directed to embodiments of methods and systems of collection for CD-ROM Drives. One embodiment provides a reception device connecting to **a serial communication interface** for receiving **operation information**. As adequately described in the

present application, the operation information comprises messages generated by the CD-ROM itself for indicating certain problems of the CD-ROM for analysis during production or repair of CD-ROM drive. In this regard, "operation information" is different from the typical data (or media) that recorded on the optical or magnetic discs.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

Rejection of claims 1 -20 based on 35 USC 103 (a)

The Office Action that rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hatano.

Claims 11-20 have been cancelled (without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, as Applicants may pursue these claims in a continuation or other application) and the rejections of these claims is moot.

With regard to the remaining claims, claims 1 and 6 are independent claims. Although Applicants do not agree with the rejection, the rejection is nevertheless moot in view of the amended claims. As amended, independent claim 1 and claim 6 define connection between the CD-ROM drive and the reception device by using a serial communication interface (not a parallel IDE interface) connection port.

The Office Action alleged that Hatano teaches a system of operation information collection for CD-ROM drives. However, Hatano teaches an apparatus (conversion device) that communicates between a parallel interface (IDE interface) and a serial interface (IEEE 1394) [FIG 2]. Clearly, what is communicated between the two interfaces is always the medium data that recorded on the optical discs or magnetic discs and not operation information generated by

the CD-ROM itself for analysis. For at least this reason, the amended claim language clearly defines over the teachings of Hatano, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office Action alleged that Hatano discloses a serial communication interface (FIG 3, feature of (7,10) having (9) interface) through which to output operation information. As shown in the FIG 3 of the Hatano's disclosure, the feature of (9) interface is a portion of the conversion device (10) and does not connect to the CD-ROM drive (10), as specifically recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, Hatano fails to disclose all of the claimed elements of independent claim 1 and claim 6, and claims 1 and 6 (as amended) should be allowed for at least these reasons.


Moreover, the dependent claims 2-5, 8-10 and the amended claim 7 should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6, as these dependent claims embody all of the limitations of claims 1 and 6 by virtue of their dependencies.

Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the claims 1-10 patently define over the cited art of record. In view of foregoing, all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500